

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

24th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXIV, No. 10

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

© June 1, 1994

R&D Faces Skimpy Budgets As Congress Allots '95 Funds

Another tough budget year is coming up for research. That's a certainty as the election-bound Congress demonstrates its devotion to deficit reduction by cutting even deeper than required by the budget deal it struck with the White House last year.

At this point, the Congressional budget decisions concern only the gross amount for domestic discretionary spending next year, fiscal 1995, which begins October 1. Within that amount, the final decisions will be made in the next few months about funding for specific agencies and their programs. But the pool from which those funds will be drawn, for research and everything else that's politically touchable, is shrinking.

Beyond the big numbers, nothing is decided, except that Congress has committed itself to appropriating outlays some \$3.6 billion below the \$543 billion requested by the President for discretionary spending in 1995. As required by the 1993 budget agreement, the Presidential request was about the

Budget Process Tough on Science—P. 3 *Non-Profit Pay: 2 Late Entries—P. 6*

same as last year's, which worked out to an inflationary loss of 2-3 percent. The frugal legislators then lopped off the additional \$3.6 billion.

Researchers wondering where the money has gone must look into the black hole of federal spending cuts, which, abetted by some revenue increases, are expected to reduce next year's deficit to \$175 billion. In fiscal 1992, the deficit stood at \$290 billion—a sum that helped finance many government activities, research included. The prodigious volume of money in the federal budget defies precision accounting, but the amount that Congress plans to appropriate for discretionary outlays in fiscal 1995 is at least \$15 billion below this year's overall level in terms of purchasing power.

With well-placed political support, it is possible for an agency or program to prosper, even in the worst of times. But the budget squeeze is so pervasive and powerful that few can escape its effects. Though the Space Station might make it through another year, following survival by just one vote in the House last year, the odds are getting worse. The National Science Foundation, grateful for the mere six-percent increase proposed in Clinton's budget, is virtually certain to get less from Congress. The National Institutes of Health is not likely to get the 4.7 percent increase proposed by the Presi-

(Continued on Page 2)

Venomous Accusations Mark Election at Psychology Assn.

The American Psychological Association (APA), a frictional combine of the therapeutic trades and the softest science, is more than customarily anxious about the outcome of its current presidential balloting.

The reason is the frontrunning candidate has survived determined efforts by APA's managers and officers to kick him off the ballot. They even tried to bar him from entering the Washington headquarters of the organization, which comprises 67,000 full-fledged members, another 60,000 affiliates and students, and 500 fulltime employees.

Thus arise the prospects of a new APA chief presiding over a bureaucracy that did its best to do him in, at rumored legal costs of some \$250,000. This is a daunting scenario, even for the APA, renowned on the association circuit for

(Continued on Page 4)

In Brief

Though plans for its creation were announced by the White House last November, the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) still does not exist. The latest word is that the paperwork for most of the 16 to 18 members has been completed and that an announcement can be expected "soon." Oldtimers on the science-policy circuit nostalgically hoping for a restoration of the glory days of Presidential science advice are likely to be disappointed. This Administration's sci-tech policies are firmly set, and there's scant interest in bright ideas for new ways to spend money.

PCAST membership does not require Senate confirmation, which can entail long delays, particularly in the end-of-session rush. Not so eight posts which expired last month on the 24-member National Science Board, policymaking body of the National Science Foundation. The President has approved choices from a list compiled by the Office of Science and Technology Policy, but they won't be seated until the Senate says okay.

Despite virtuoso writhing and rhetoric by the academic and scientific lobbies, the Administration remains firm about its euphemistically titled "pause" in indirect cost payments for research, which means that no institution can skim off more than it got last year, even if total receipts for research go up.

The Department of Energy has announced plans to shell out more money for finding alternative use for the site of the politically throttled Superconducting Super Collider. Awards of \$25,000 to \$150,000 will be made to explore six suggestions in the areas of research and education. Congress, however, retains the right to say no.

... Seeking Last-Chance Deal to Save Space Station

(Continued from Page 1)

dent. Energy and agricultural research face similar prospects.

The most likely exception to the sweep of frugality is a Clinton favorite, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), budgeted by the White House for an 80 percent increase, to nearly \$1 billion. Popular in Congress, too, NIST will grow substantially, but approval of that conspicuously rapid pace looks doubtful.

The fine details of suffering and salvation will first begin to emerge later this month, as the appropriations subcommittees in the House render their verdicts. After that, there's still a long way to go in the legislative process before spending bills are completed and ready for the President, usually in September, at the earliest.

In and around the federal research establishment, the grim arithmetic of the '95 budget has fostered a mood of doomsday acquiescence, occasionally relieved by sheer fantasy. In the latter category, the NIH lobby, as usual, soars on pipedreams, as manifested recently in a pronouncement from the National Health Council, an association of NIH beneficiaries, recommending a 1995 appropriation of \$16.6 billion, rather than the \$11.4 billion proposed by the White House.

They're also pinning hopes on a scheme proposed by Senators Tom Harkin and Mark Hatfield to attach a one-percent research tax to health-insurance premiums, with the proceeds destined for a trust fund for NIH, in addition to the annual Congressional appropriation. The proposal must overcome the political dual aversion to tax increases and earmarked funds. The White House is cool to the Harkin-Hatfield plan. Congress is terrorized by tax increases.

Meanwhile, the National Science Foundation plods along in quest of that five-year budget doubling promised long ago by the Reagan White House as hush money for researchers concerned about the broad fiscal impact of the Superconducting Super Collider on federal research spending. NSF has never got there, and memories are foggy about when the five-year period was to begin or end, and whether the doubling was in constant dollars, current dollars, or possibly some other measure of money—the federal budgeting system has several. NSF officials speak in public about Clinton restoring the “trajectory” of the doubling plan. But one senior NSF official conceded to SGR that there's considerable confusion about the baseline and the pace.

The latest blow to NSF's hopes came last month when an old friend of the Foundation, Rep. Sherwood Boehlert (R-New York), proved his fealty to frugality by pushing across an amendment to cut \$50 million from the NSF authorization.

Suggestive of a terminal case, the most vigorous efforts at budget resuscitation in the sci-tech area are focused on the Space Station. Christened *Freedom* by its progenitor, Ronald Reagan, it was mysteriously renamed *Alpha* last year when

NASA, in another heroic attempt at political salvation, brought in the crumbling ex-Soviet space establishment as a partner. The rationale for teaming the crippled and the inept was that Space Station income would divert the Russians from going into mischievous missile deals with rogue governments.

The Russian assistance comes at a heavy cost for the financially beleaguered NASA, an estimated \$400 million initially, later raised to \$600 million. NASA originally said the spending would be recouped in time savings made possible by employing ex-Soviet hardware and facilities to speed up construction of the Space Station. But by many accounts, the Russian space enterprise has fallen into deep disrepair. Many doubts persist about its potential usefulness.

In any case, *Alpha*, for which a classier name is now being sought, continues to lose vital signs. The reality of this albatross is that it's an inherited folly, out of harmony with NASA Administrator Daniel Goldin's sensible preference for modest, inexpensive, and plentiful space projects, rather than the financially ravenous, goliath ventures of NASA's affluent years. But the Space Station produces jobs, which help get votes, and the Clinton Administration, with Goldin loyally on board, is making an all-out effort to save the project from the budget cutters.

The job count directly linked to the Space Station is said to be around 40,000, mainly concentrated in the aerospace industry, which has hemorrhaged some 400,000 jobs over the past five years, many in California, vital to Clinton's reelection. In contrast to the perfunctory rescue attempt staged by the White House for the Superconducting Super Collider (a mere 7000 jobs), the Space Station is getting prime attention from the Administration, particularly from Vice President Gore, but with Clinton also lending a hand.

The most serious spoiler in the picture is Congressman George Brown (D-Calif.), Chairman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and long an arch supporter of the Space Station. Brown surprised the space establishment in April by warning that NASA must be saved from the burdens of the project, either by an infusion of additional money or cancellation of the Space Station and

(Continued on Page 3)

© 1994, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$425.00 (two years, \$730.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

Science at Disadvantage in Budgeting Process

Research budgets must survive many pitfalls before checks can arrive in the lab. Among the worst and least known of these hazards is the process in which Congress's total annual spending package is doled out among the 13 appropriations subcommittees in each house.

The subcommittees are highly influential, though not omnipotent, in deciding which agency gets how much. The division of the big bundle is made in closed session by the so-called College of Cardinals, the chairs of the subcommittees. Each gets an "allocation" to divide among the agencies in its jurisdiction. More money, of course, eases the competition, but Congress and the White House vowed in 1993 to hold down spending for five years.

Along with the rest of the government, research agencies are constricted by the overall spending limits. But they face another problem: many of them, usually for reasons of historical accident, are funded by subcommittees that are also responsible for politically popular non-science agencies. Within a subcommittee, however, they're all competing for the same pool of money.

For example, the Department of Energy's basic research programs are funded through the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, which also provides money for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Outlays this year for all the agencies in the Subcommittee's jurisdiction totaled \$22.4 billion; for 1995, the White House proposed a reduction of nearly \$1.5 billion, to \$20.9 billion. The fiscal 1995 allocation for the Subcommittee is \$81 million below the White House figure. In the competition for a diminished sum of money, DOE science will be competing with water and reclamation projects, high among the most popular items on the Congressional agenda.

The National Institutes of Health also faces a fiscal bind. NIH gets its money from a subcommittee that embraces the Departments of Labor and Education, plus

NIH's parent Department of Health and Human Services and a flock of minor agencies. Outlays for all of them this year came to \$67.6 billion. The President requested a small increase, to \$70.3 billion, for next year. The 1995 allocation for the subcommittee is \$69.8 billion, \$2.2 billion above last year's figure, but some \$500 million below the President's request. Education and Labor programs are politically popular and dear to the Clinton White House. Biomedical research enjoys public favor, but does not arouse political passions. The \$500 million increase that Clinton proposed for NIH thus looks very doubtful.

The National Science Foundation and NASA are bunched in an appropriations subcommittee that funds the Department of Veterans Affairs—the most politically untouchable agency in the US government—and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, an agency with a broad constituency and popular social goals. Outlays for the whole pack for this year came out to \$70.6 billion.

The White House asked for an increase of nearly \$2.3 billion. The emphasis was elsewhere than NASA, which was budgeted for a reduction of \$250 million, while NSF was dealt a modest increase of about \$200 million, which would bring its 1995 budget up to \$3.2 billion. The 1995 allocation for the subcommittee was \$45 million short of the President's request.

Agriculture, which doesn't rate high in the Administration's political considerations, took another beating in the budget process. Outlays this year total \$14.2 billion. The White House proposed a reduction of \$260 million. The 1995 allocation was \$68 million below that, for a total of \$13.9 billion.

The obvious, often-asked question is why Congress doesn't tidy up these odd convergences of disparate items. The answer is that the powers that be welcome additions to their jurisdictions, but resist losses.

Cuts for NASA (Continued from Page 2)

redeployment of its budget to the many starvelings of the space agency.

After floating this thesis with little apparent effect, Brown presented a refined version on May 19 in the form of an authorization bill with magical qualities. The Brown bill would satisfy the blood thirst for spending cuts by reducing the President's figure for NASA, from \$14.3 billion to \$14.15 billion, while saving the Space Station and presumably doing minimal harm in other parts of NASA.

The savings sought by Brown would come from eliminating a shuttle flight, a Spacelab mission, and a new start for a Mars Surveyor. Calling the press to one of his periodic bull sessions in a committee hearing room, Brown declared himself dug in at the \$14.15 billion mark for NASA. "For those of you who have been asking where I have drawn the

line on support for the Space Station," he stated, "this is the line. With fewer resources than this, I will oppose the Space Station program in its current form, either by reducing funding for the Station or killing it outright and redistributing these resources among other NASA programs."

Redistribution is a separate and sensitive matter, more in the province of NASA's appropriations subcommittee than Brown's committee, an authorizing body that cannot award money. Memories are fresh and sore about the \$650 million that Congress denied the SSC, thus killing the venture. The money did not become available for other research activities. It just disappeared into the federal maw.

Brown's position on the Space Station counts heavily, however, because he led the past struggles to save the venture. If he declines to fight for it again, that's the end of

(Continued on Page 4)

... Accusations and Denials of Harrassing Employees

(Continued from Page 1)
acrimonious office politics.

The leading candidate for APA President-elect is an eminently respectable academic, Lewis P. Lipsitt, PhD, a 64-year-old, career-long Professor of Psychology and Medical Science at Brown University. An APA member for 40 years, he has held various important positions in the Association. In a field of five candidates, with the results of a mail ballot due on July 1, Lipsitt is considered the leader. In last year's APA presidential election, he was the runnerup, paving the way, according to APA voting patterns, for success on the second try.

Lipsitt's difficulties with the APA began prior to that first presidential race, when he took a two-year leave from Brown in 1990 to become Executive Director of the APA Science Directorate. That part of the APA was then still reeling from a breakaway movement that led to the creation in 1988 of the American Psychological Society, now with 15,000 members, which emphasizes research over therapeutic practice.

Oddly enough, Lipsitt helped found the fledgling rival organization, and served on its board until taking over the Science Directorate at the venerable APA. He told SGR last week that he regarded the new Psychological Society as a "complementary rather than a rival organization"—a view not widely shared in the faction-ridden domain of psychology.

After Lipsitt began the new job, difficulties of a disputed nature promptly ensued, with allegations that he harassed women employees in the Science Directorate. APA management says it became concerned about the possibility of harassment suits under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. According to the May 1994 issue of the *APA Monitor*, tame house organ of the Association, 12 employees gave sworn

depositions in which they said Lipsitt had behaved in a hostile manner, "had asked a female employee to be a 'good little girl'," threw a telephone at one worker and suggested that employees "who complained about an optical illusion with a joking sexual message that he posted on an office bulletin board, had sexual problems of their own."

In a recent e-mailed statement tied to his current presidential campaign, Lipsitt denied these charges, stating: "I have never, ever, engaged in sexual or other harassment of an employee, student, co-worker, or anyone. I have never, ever as an adult, thrown anything at anyone. I do not think I have raised my voice at anyone in 45 or 50 years, other than my own children."

No charges were filed against Lipsitt, nor was an investigation undertaken. The harassment issue continued to fester.

In November 1991, with six months to go on his two-year contract with APA, Lipsitt agreed to step down as head of the Science Directorate and assume the post of Science Officer, outside the Directorate. He did so, he explained in his recent campaign e-mail to the electorate, because he "did not wish to exacerbate the APA's personnel problems or damage the organization's public image."

However, despite Lipsitt's good-soldier performance, APA concluded that further steps were necessary. According to a report this past April from the APA Board of Directors to the APA Council of Representatives, when the November 1991 agreement "did not appear to eliminate all of the problems," a new agreement between Lipsitt and the APA was signed in March 1992. The agreement formally declared Lipsitt an outcast from the APA.

"Effective immediately," it stated, "Lipsitt will no longer

(Continued on Page 5)

Budget Woes

(Continued from Page 3)

it, given last year's one-vote escape. The Congressman's role in this drama is fully recognized by the White House. When Brown went home to his Riverside, California, district for the weekend of May 21-22, he didn't have to endure the indignities of commercial air travel. Air Force One was heading that way, and Bill Clinton invited Brown to ride along.

There's talk of collaring some Defense money for the Space Station, though the Pentagon has been on alert against budget raiders ever since Senator Tom Harkin filched \$210 million in military funds in 1992 for, of all things, breast cancer research.

Among all the research agencies, the new fiscal year may be an especially gloomy one for NIH. The death of Rep. William Natcher took away a shrewd legislator who regarded his chairmanship of the NIH Appropriations Subcommittee as a sacred trust and a warrant to raise money for biomedical research. Natcher doted on NIH and NIH, realizing its good fortune, chose to immortalize the Kentucky Congressman

several years ago by putting his name on a huge building now nearing completion on the Bethesda, Md., campus. Natcher's successor in the chair, Neal Smith, of Iowa, is a 74-year-old lawyer and farmer who had heretofore shown little interest in biomedical research.

Smith served on Natcher's subcommittee, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, while also serving as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary—a post he gave up in succeeding Natcher. Why make the change? The obvious reason is money: The Subcommittee that Smith formerly chaired doles out about \$25 billion a year. The chairmanship he inherited works with \$70 billion.

The country wanted deficit reduction, and it's getting it. With few exceptions, federal activities are being crimped to produce good numbers, though the beneficial effects of severe deficit cutting are increasingly being questioned. No matter. The budget deal of 1993 runs for a full five years. Fiscal 1995 will be rough on research. The next few years are very likely to be worse.—DSG

... Agreement Barred Entry to APA Headquarters

(Continued from Page 4)

use the title of Science Officer. He will have no duty to perform any services for APA and will assume no responsibilities in any capacity as an employee/agent of APA apart from the signing of this agreement through its termination. He will not attend any meetings as an employee of APA, including Executive Staff meetings. He will not visit the APA facilities except by specific invitation from the Chief Executive Officer."

Termination date? The agreement did not specify one. But the deal was generous for Lipsitt, who continued to collect his APA salary of \$150,000 a year from March through the end of his contract in August 1992. In addition, APA paid his expenses for previously arranged professional engagements, including an international Congress in Brussels.

The agreement included a confidentiality provision which assured that the APA members remained unaware of these tumultuous events in their professional organization. At the time, the *APA Monitor* published nothing about Lipsitt's departure. An APA spokeswoman told SGR that the omission reflected a desire to protect Lipsitt's reputation. Lipsitt and the APA thus parted in 1992, and he soon after resumed his professorship at Brown.

In 1993, however, Lipsitt was back in APA affairs, as a candidate for President-elect, a one-year stint that automatically leads to the Presidency in the following year. Despite the draconian agreement it had forged to get rid of him, no one at APA challenged his candidacy—though it was seemingly in violation of his contractual vow to stay out of APA affairs. In the usual field of five, Lipsitt came in a strong second under the so-called Hare system of voting, which requires the voters to rank each candidate. In the first round, Lipsitt received 5009 votes to the winner's 6156; in the fourth and final round, Lipsitt's count was 6655 to 9413 for the winner.

With Lipsitt heading for another run, and precedent suggesting that he would be a shoo-in for the 1994 election, APA management went to Federal District Court for the District of Columbia this past February to seek an order barring his candidacy on the grounds that it would violate the 1992 agreement. The impetus for the request, APA said, was renewed expressions of harassment fears among APA employees should Lipsitt return to the organization.

APA was, as the saying goes, laughed out of court—at a cost to himself of \$80,000 in legal fees, Lipsitt says; with good lines into the APA, he estimates its legal costs at \$250,000.

A ruling on April 6 by Judge Royce C. Lamberth observed that APA tolerated Lipsitt's 1993 run for the presidency without any objection, and didn't wince at his entry into the nominating process for the 1994 election. The ruling also noted that Jack Wiggins, Chairman of the APA Elections Committee, certified Lipsitt's 1993 candidacy, "despite his

"Intrigue and Chicanery"

From a letter May 11 by Professor Robert C. Carson, Duke University Department of Psychology: Social and Health Sciences, to Raymond Fowler, Chief Executive Officer of the American Psychological Association.

[Lipsitt] was "hung out to dry," and you will be perceived as contributing substantially to that outcome. You will also be perceived, incidentally, and rightly or wrongly, as having inappropriately attempted to manage the outcome of an APA presidential election. Those are "heavy" costs to bear, and so I had some difficulty in understanding why on earth you would place yourself in such a morally and politically untenable position. Knowing and respecting you for as long as I have, it is relatively easy for me to give you the benefit of the doubt....

Others will be far less charitable in their judgments, I'm sure, because they would expect of you that you rise above the internal intrigue and chicanery for which APA is becoming (apparently deservedly) infamous.

The stakes, it seems to me, are very high, as we must reflect on the consequences of another massive wave of defections among academic psychologists. If you have damage control options, you will need to deploy them very soon; if they include a further attack on Lew Lipsitt, you will have lost not the battle but the war.

knowledge of the March 1992 agreement. Dr. Wiggins was a member of the personnel committee when Dr. Lipsitt's March 1992 contract was negotiated," the Judge pointed out, adding that Wiggins "had been informed of the contract." Furthermore, the decision stated, a "go ahead" for Lipsitt's 1993 candidacy was given by Raymond Fowler, then and now APA Chief Executive Officer (at a salary of \$208,650 in 1992).

Noting the absence of prior objections to Lipsitt's candidacy, Judge Lamberth observed, "It is uncontroverted that the runner-up in the 1993 election would probably become the president in 1994, yet nothing was said to the defendant."

Ruling against the APA's motion to block Lipsitt's candidacy, the Judge directed APA "to cease any efforts to prevent Dr. Lipsitt's name from appearing on the APA presidential ballot or to thwart Dr. Lipsitt's efforts in running for president of the APA." The decision also noted that the duration of the agreement between Lipsitt and the APA was fogged by "the ambiguous nature of the contract."

In effect, the Judge also lifted the confidentiality agreement by stating, "Anyone can fully discuss the subject matter of this litigation."

Whereupon, just before the ballots were to be mailed to

(Continued on Page 6)

... Lipsitt Says APA Plagued by Politics, Staff Unrest

(Continued from Page 5)

APA's 67,000 eligible voters, the *APA Monitor* published its first account of the Lipsitt affair—a tawdry, tilted version that invidiously began: "In response to a letter from seven female employees objecting to the candidacy of Lewis P. Lipsitt, PhD, for President-elect of the American Psychological Association, last month APA sought a judicial ruling on whether a separation agreement signed by Lipsitt when he was an APA employee would disqualify him from serving as president."

Going into considerable detail about the harassment allegations, the *Monitor* stated, "Because Lipsitt agreed to leave his position and have no further contact with members of the Science Directorate staff, no formal charges were ever brought against Lipsitt. The Association provided Lipsitt with a letter stating that APA had not charged him with sexual harassment, nor had it concluded that sexual harassment had occurred."

Lipsitt, who is easily reachable, told SGR that the *Monitor* did not attempt to speak to him in preparation of the article.

Back at the APA, the chiefs of the fulltime bureaucracy are continuing their campaign against Lipsitt's candidacy. In a column scheduled for publication in the June *Monitor*, the current head of the APA Science Directorate, William Howell, explains that he initiated the request for a legal challenge to Lipsitt's candidacy.

"Members of my staff approached me with their concerns," Howell wrote, "indicating that APA management

had promised to protect them from further dealings with Dr. Lipsitt. They expressed fear at the prospect of this individual assuming a role that would not only involve interaction with them, but could have influence over their lives at APA." Howell added that he felt a "moral—and organizational—obligation to do what I could to ensure that APA's commitment to those employees was honored."

In his campaign statement by e-mail, Lipsitt suggests that the APA's performance arises from the longstanding tensions within the organization between practitioners and researchers. (Of the five candidates in the election, he's the only one with a strong background in research.)

"APA has been plagued for several years by great unrest, much of it politically motivated within the staff of the organization," Lipsitt stated. He described the "internal strife" as "related to unfortunate contentiousness between scientists and practitioners of the association," noting that it has "involved defection of large numbers of discontented scientists to a new organization, the American Psychological Society."

The 67,000 ballots were mailed third class between May 7-15. As the marked ballots are returned, they are recorded in the office of CEO Raymond Fowler. Lipsitt said he has "expressed concerns" about this method of tallying, saying he would prefer the use of an independent, outside organization for vote counting—a practice employed by many organizations.

But, at this point, he said, he is not contesting the balloting method.—DSG

Non-Profit Salaries: Medical Colleges Assn., Physical Society

SGR has caught up with two organizations whose tax returns weren't available in time for the latest annual survey of senior non-profit salaries, published April 1.

Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC). The latest return, delayed by filing extensions, is dated May 16, 1994, and covers the year ending June 30, 1993, in which the AAMC reported total revenues of \$30.7 million.

Befitting the Washington representative of the nation's medical schools and administrator of their entrance exams and admissions paperwork, the tax return reflects the AAMC's status as one of the top payers among the non-profits. Robert C. Petersdorf, who retired last April as President, was recorded for a salary of \$330,000—a \$20,000 raise—plus \$33,000 in benefits and \$10,572 for expenses. The return states that the AAMC President "is required to live in the residence owned by the organization." Also listed for salaries and benefits:

Edward Stemmler, Executive Vice President, \$240,000; \$24,000.

Richard A. Knapp, Senior Vice President, \$220,000; \$22,000.

Robert Dickler, Vice President, \$215,000; benefits not stated.

Joseph Keyes, Vice President, \$160,000; \$16,000.

Donald Kassebaum, Vice President, \$160,000; \$16,000.

Herbert Nickens, Vice President, \$148,000; \$14,800.

American Physical Society (APS). Making its debut in the SGR survey, the APS is a modest provider on the non-profit scale, despite total revenues of \$27 million. Nearly \$20 million of that amount came from publication sales and subscriptions; \$2.7 million was provided by membership dues and assessments.

The latest return, filed May 13, 1994, covers the year ending June 30, 1993, with salaries and benefits reported as follows (all full-time, unless indicated):

Richard Werthamer, Executive Secretary (who left the post last year), \$146,000; \$21,187.

Harry Lustig, Treasurer ("part-time—90%"), \$116,256; \$16,965.

Ben Bederson, Editor in Chief ("part-time—50%"), \$64,600; benefits not listed.

Peter Adams, Editor, \$83,538; \$7428.

Margaret Vassilikos, Assistant Treasurer, \$77,868; \$2960.

Cynthia Rice, Editor, \$84,452; \$3450.

Stanley Brown, Editor, \$81,812; \$3256.

Gene Wells, Editor, \$77,444; \$2928.

In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

Foundation's Law and Social Science Program, the Justice Department's National Institute of Justice, and the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Add \$4 per volume for shipping. The four volumes are also available as a package for \$138.95; the latest three volumes for \$99.

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Lockbox 285, Washington, DC 20055; tel. 1-800/624-6242; in the Washington, DC, area: 202/334-3313.

European Aeronautics: Strong Government Presence in Industry Structure and Research and Development Support (GAO/NSIAD-94-71; 61 pp., no charge), from the General Accounting Office (GAO), a look at help provided to aircraft manufacturers by the governments of France, Germany, and the UK, estimated to total \$4.8 billion for R&D in 1992. "The European aeronautics industry has had a long history of government assistance and, in some cases, ownership," the GAO reports. It notes that government assistance is generally provided on a "success-dependent" basis, i.e., repayment is required only after a given sales level has been reached. Quoting a US Commerce Department study, the GAO report says the three European countries invested \$13.5 billion "in direct support" of the Airbus development, of which \$3.5 billion had been repaid by August 1993. The report does not discuss government support for the US air industry. A letter of comment to the GAO from NASA describes European aeronautics as "well-funded, highly cooperative efforts," adding that it is "unfortunate, but not surprising" that the Europeans did not fully bare their financial souls to the US investigators. The letter, from J.R. Dailey, NASA Associate Deputy Administrator, picks up on the trendy competitive theme and declares that the European tradition of industrial subsidy "is a challenge to the United States that requires a strong response." The report was requested by the Technology, Environment and Aviation Subcommittee of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Also from the GAO: **Pesticides: Options to Achieve a Single Regulatory Standard** (GAO/RCED-94-57; 34 pp.), discusses the issues involved in resolving the differing legal standards in the two major federal statutes governing pesticides—the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. "Because scientific data are not always adequate to quantify risks and benefits," the report states, "the choice of an appropriate regulatory standard entails value judgments and is, ultimately, a policy decision."

Environmental Cleanup: Too Many High Priority Sites Impede DOD's Program (GAO/NSIAD-94-133; 27 pp., no charge), says the Defense Department has accomplished little in spending \$3.6 billion over a decade on environmental cleanup of "high-priority" sites, for which the total cleanup cost, now estimated at \$18.2 billion, "is likely to increase."

Among the problems cited by DOD, the report says, is the role played by the Environmental Protection Agency, which is said to put a high-priority label on some sites that pose little threat, while ignoring some nasty ones. The report was requested by Senator John Glenn, Chairman of the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Chemical Weapons Destruction: Advantages and Disadvantages of Alternatives to Incineration (GAO/NSIAD-94-123; 28 pp., no charge), summarizes the legislative and potential treaty requirements for destruction of the 25,000 tons of unitary chemical weapons stored by the US at eight domestic sites and at Johnston Atoll. Noting public opposition to incineration, the main technique to date, the GAO report assesses various other techniques, noting that they would require "at least 13 years—until 2007—to proceed sequentially through all the stages of development and reach maturity." Rep. Mike Synar, Chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources, requested the report.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

An Institute Specific Analysis of Funding for Academic R&D in the Chemical Sciences at the National Institutes of Health FY 1982 to FY 1991 (8 pp., no charge), from the American Chemical Society, a followup to an ACS report last November on NIH's general funding of chemical R&D. Written by David L. Schutt, Manager of the ACS Office of Science Policy Analysis, the analysis covers trends in research awards, fellowships, etc., among the institutes that provide most NIH support for chemistry and biochemistry.

Order from: American Chemical Society, Department of Government Relations and Science Policy, attn. Christopher Shafer, 1155 16th St. NW, Washington, DC 20036; tel. 202/452-2127; fax 202/872-6206.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$425.00 ☐
two years, \$730.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$35.00 per year; non-USA surface mail, \$15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# _____ Exp. date _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

Research and Development in Industry: Funds, 1990; Scientists and Engineers, January 1991 (NSF 94-304; 144 pp., no charge), from the National Science Foundation, a collection of statistics and analyses, sorted by industrial sector and company size, most of it published piecemeal in recent years. An overview shows that spending (in 1987 dollars) on industrial R&D by government and private firms peaked at \$94 billion in 1988 and then slowly declined to an estimated \$91 billion in 1992. The decline occurred mainly in the federal portion, down from \$31 billion in 1988 to \$26 billion estimated for 1992. R&D spending by industry reached \$65 billion in 1989, and was still there three years later. Industry's average annual employment of R&D scientists and engineers reached a high of 725,000 in 1989 and declined to 720,000 in 1990. During the last few years, not covered in this report, most of the numbers have continued to fall. John R. Gawalt was NSF Project Officer for the report, part of a series, published by NSF about every five years, with data derived from surveys by the Bureau of the Census.

Order from: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Studies, Arlington, Virginia 22230; tel. 703/306-1780; fax 703/644-4278; Internet pubs@nsf.gov.

Space Activities of the United States, CIS, and Other Launching Countries/Organizations: 1957-1993 (94-347 SPR; 170 pp., no charge), from the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service, a launch-by-launch compilation of just about everything that's been sent into space during those years, by the major and minor space powers, including the post-USSR Commonwealth of Independent States. Included are reviews of national space programs, international collaboration, and summaries of the various policy studies and recommendations spawned by uncertainties about the American space program. The report was written by Marcia S. Smith.

Also from the Congressional Research Service: **Domestic Oil: Past, Present, and Future** (94-263 SPR; 16 pp., no charge), a gloomy presentation on a subject that has been pushed from public attention by bargain prices at the gas pump. The report, by Joseph P. Riva Jr., notes that annual production of oil in the US peaked at 3.3 billion barrels in 1970 and has slowly declined to an estimated 2.2 billion barrels this year—about half of US consumption. "New giant fields, from which large amounts of oil can be produced from relatively few wells, are needed if declining domestic production is to be shored up, thus keeping energy affordable," the report states. It points out, however, that the most promising prospects are in environmentally sensitive areas of Alaska and off the California coast. The report focuses on oil

production and does not discuss alternative energy supplies or conservation.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (94-254 SPR; 7 pp., no charge), a quick review of programs at the fast-growing NIST, centerpiece of the Clinton Administration's drive to invigorate industry with heavy doses of federal research money. Budgeted by the White House for nearly \$1 billion next year—an 80 percent increase—NIST is on the long-term charts for \$1.4 billion in fiscal 1997. The report gingerly raises the question of whether NIST has the internal resources to manage its bountiful budget and programs, but offers no conclusions. Lennard G. Kruger and Wendy H. Schacht wrote the report.

These reports are available through the offices of Senators and Congressmen. Specify the Congressional Research Service and the publication number and title. Senate switchboard: 202/224-3121; House: 202/225-3121.

How Should the Recommended Dietary Allowances [RDAs] Be Revised? (36 pp., no charge), from the Food and Nutrition Board, in the Institute of Medicine, health-policy wing of the National Academy of Sciences, another cautious step into the minefields of nutrition politics, which is crowded with food-industry watchdogs, public-interest warriors, scientists (objective and bought), and vociferous dietary cranks. The perils of tinkering with the RDAs, last issued in 1989, are symbolized by the title of this publication, which grows out of a June 1993 Board-sponsored conference neutrally titled "Should the Recommended Dietary Allowances Be Revised?" Reporting an affirmative response to that question, the Board says the big issue for the next edition is the relationship of diet and chronic diseases. In addressing this subject, the Board promises to move slowly. Having evolved on the question of revision from "Should" to "How," it says the next phase "would require several years and an intense level of activity" to produce a new edition and other materials. The Board is chaired by Janet C. King, Department of Nutritional Sciences, UC Berkeley.

Order from: Food and Nutrition Board, Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; fax 202/334-2316.

From the National Academy of Sciences, Volumes 2, 3, and 4, completing the NAS series **Understanding and Preventing Violence**, collections of reports and commissioned papers on the politically sensitive and scientifically wobbly subject of what research reveals or suggests about the origins and prevention of violence. The subtitles of the individual volumes are: **Biobehavioral Influences: Volume 2** (549 pp., \$45); **Social Influences: Volume 3** (592 pp., \$45); **Consequences and Control: Volume 4** (408 pp., \$39). Volume 1 in the series, titled **Understanding and Preventing Violence** (480 pp., \$49.95), was published last year. The reports were prepared under the supervision of the Academy's Panel on the Understanding and Control of Violent Behavior, chaired by Albert J. Reiss Jr., Department of Sociology, Yale University. Support was provided by the National Science

(Continued on Page 7)

